Dear Jim, Anson/McDonald 12/20/75

The 12/15/75 1 a/m. NBC tape you loaned me is, I take it, the Tom Snyder Show.

I listened to it this evening while Lil was grocery shopping. Frascinating?!!

On both of them.

My first comment is to please ask everyone you know for whatever tapes they have on either. It is not so much that I need any more on McDonald as it is the chance of learning more from him. Several ways. His hesitations are significant. And on this he departed from his own bio to put himself working in Chicago in 1967. He says he then hired Kimsey for security work for specified banks. To give their names would be to run the risk of public refutation, so maybe he did. He says Kimsey was in the same work - true - so he hired him. False. Kimsey worked not alone but for Davidov. Who has switched his story to me and stayed away in person. Interestingly on this the book, after I told Len he had been libelled in it, makes an insignificant change in his name for which there is no apparent purpose other than for Len to pretend there is no suit. This whole thing gets more fascinating all the time. There remains that Puerto Rico-based Texas outfit that claimed to have solved the crime and it had a name identical with Len's company before he sold it except for the addition of "International."

My greater interest is in Anson. What I learned in listening to this is that he lacks the most elemental knowledge of what he has written about. There are also implausibilities. And what I am sure you must have noted without saying anything to me, except for where he goes off on his own rubbish, which was no good in New Times, it is my lines and mine alone. Now it just isn't possible for this guy to think identically as I alone among the critics do and to have stayed away; it isn't possible that he doesn't know he is doing exactly what he condemns, conjecturing a solution; it just isn't natural for him to have been a silent reporter during the Garrison years and to suddenly develop this great passion against Garrison because he messed it all up. Until this year Anson had no interest. Why the high blood pressure? Makes no sense. None at all as innocence. Now I can't see it is easy or natural for him to have picked up what I have been saying in this short a while and written the book and even read those he credits. He has been fed this approach.

Bearing on much of the foregoing he is passionate in his objection to McDonald's alleged libel of the CIA. Understandable except for the heat. But does he condmn the CIA? That I'lllearn only from his book. My suspicion is that he will repeat enough of what was known to give himself credibility and to accomplish the purposes of a black book with his own adaptation of the Mafia theory. As you noted, he refused to deny he was CIA. Why not? Why make it merely ridiculous. Or if he had to with a book and all that goes with it at stake, why not add to the objection of ridiculousness, for the record I am not and never have been?

McDonald said the Saul picture was given to the Dallas police the morning of the assassination by the CIA and Anson didn't catch it. McDonald claims to have seen the pictures first here in the FBI. In his early book version in a paper. When I told the Enquirer it hadn't been published when he claimed to have seen it he switched his story. Anson knows so little about the locale he didn't even clobber McDonald for saying LHO was to have been shot from the Records Bldg.(McDonald has trouble remembering its name and doesn't mention it in the first two versions) That is a physical impossibility.

Don't let Jerry know any of these things and we don't want him to blow the possibilities if there is nay way of nay one getting him of his quest for attention and feeling it makes him important.

I have more questions than ever about Anson and his colleagues.

Excuse the fancy paper. The Playboy researcher used up almost all my copy paper and wasted some positive sheets, too. Hastily,